UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,737	07/24/2003	Koji Dairiki	0756-7176	8059

31780 7590 12/29/2005

ERIC ROBINSON
PMB 955
21010 SOUTHBANK ST.
POTOMAC FALLS, VA 20165

EXAMINER
GUERRERO, MARIA F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2822	

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/625,737	DAIRIKI, KOJI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Maria Guerrero	2822	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 December 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *2,4,6,8,10 and 12-18* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,5,7,9,11 and 19-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed November 10, 2005 and the Request for continued examination filed December 12, 2005.

Status of Claims

2. Claims 1-21 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 12, 2005 has been entered.

Priority

4. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 09/970,908, filed on October 5, 2001.

Election/Restrictions

5. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable

generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on December 16, 2004. Claims 13-18 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai et al. (US 6,333,493) in view of Ballantine et al. (US 6,105,274).

Sakurai et al. discloses heating a treatment object by irradiating it through radiation from a lamp light source (halogen lamp) (col. 7, lines 8-15, col. 12, lines 65-67,

col. 13, lines 1-3). Sakurai et al. teaches the radiation from the lamp light source being 10 or 20 seconds at a time and repeating several times (col. 1, lines 65-67, col. 2, lines 1-5, col. 8, lines 48-60, col. 9, lines 25-30, col. 11, lines 23-30, col. 13, lines 53-57, col. 18, lines 20-35, col. 19, lines 5-18, col. 22, lines 13-35, col. 24, lines 23-37, col. 25, lines 5-10). Sakurai et al. shows the input voltage is controlled at an interval of 0.5 seconds so as to stabilize the temperature with the temperature set in advance by the control device (col. 9, lines 14-20). Sakurai et al. discloses turning off the lamp light source and cooling the object (Fig. 18, col. 7, lines 19-24, col. 10, lines 37-47).

Sakurai et al. does not specifically show the specific range as claimed. However, in the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a prima facie case of obviousness exists. In re Wertheim, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Sakurai et al. does not specifically show holding the treatment object in a processing chamber filled with a coolant, the coolant being nitrogen or helium. However, Sakurai et al. discloses cooling the treatment object (col. 10, lines 37-47). In addition, Ballantine et al. is presented as evidence to show that holding the treatment object in a processing chamber filled with a coolant is conventional in the art. Ballantine et al. teaches holding the treatment object in a processing chamber filled with a coolant, the coolant being nitrogen or helium, and increasing or decreasing the amount of the coolant (Abstract, col. 2, lines 27-67, col. 3, lines 1-65, col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5, lines 1-32, 50-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to recognize that the claimed range overlaps or lies inside the range disclosed by Sakurai et al. and a prima facie case of obviousness exists. In re Wertheim, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In addition, a prior art reference that discloses a range encompassing a somewhat narrower claimed range is sufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness." In re Peterson, 315 F.3d 1325, 1330, 65 USPQ2d 1379, 1382-83 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to specify the step of applying a coolant to the treatment object and the coolant being nitrogen or helium as taught by Ballantine et al. in order to minimize the time that the object stays at undesirable temperatures (Ballantine et al., col. 3, lines 10-20).

7. Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. (US 5,44,217).

Moore et al. discloses heating a treatment object by irradiating it through radiation from a lamp light source (halogen lamp) (col. 4, lines 5-15, col. 10, lines 25-67, col. 11, lines 1-55, col. 14, lines 15-25, col. 23, lines 7-25). Moore et al. describes holding the treatment object in a processing chamber filled with a coolant (nitrogen) for cooling the treatment object and an amount of supply of the coolant being reduced (col. 10, lines 25-45, col. 15, lines 40-65, col. 16, lines 1-6). Moore et al. shows heating the

treatment object in the range of about 1 to about 15 seconds (col. 4, lines 5-15, col. 10, lines 65-67, col. 11, lines 1-20).

Moore et al. does not specifically show the specific range as claimed. However, in the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a prima facie case of obviousness exists. In re Wertheim, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to recognize that the claimed range overlaps or lies inside the range disclosed by Moore et al. and a prima facie case of obviousness exists. In re Wertheim, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In addition, a prior art reference that discloses a range encompassing a somewhat narrower claimed range is sufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness." In re Peterson, 315 F.3d 1325, 1330, 65 USPQ2d 1379, 1382-83 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11 and 19-21 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 13-28 of copending Application No. 10/001,197. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the basic steps of heating by irradiating through radiation from a lamp light, cooling by applying a coolant, and the radiation from the lamp light source lasts 0.1 to 20 seconds are recited by claims 13-28 of copending Application No. 10/001,197.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11 and 19-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Yamazaki et al. (US 6,759,313) (same assignee) teaches several embodiments related to applicant's disclosure.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maria Guerrero whose telephone number is 571-272-1837.

12. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zandra Smith can be reached on 571-272-2429. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

December 21, 2005

Maria Guerrero
MARIA F. GUERRERO
PRIMARY EXAMINER